REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-12 are pending. The claims as originally filed were incorrectly numbered 1-3 and 5-11. Accordingly these claims have been amended herein to be properly numbered as claims 1-10. New independent claims 11 and 12 have also been added.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Iwata et al. '602.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bartelmuss et al.

The Examiner indicated that claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinte.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 and 3 on the grounds that the relationship of the roller means of claim 1 and the limitation in claim 3 that the roller is on a shaft adapted to enable rotation of a roller is unclear. Claim 3 has been amended herein to more clearly recite the invention. Claim 3 merely specifies one type of roller means that may be employed in accordance

with the invention. Specifically claim 3 describes the embodiment of the invention shown in Fig. 4 in which a single roller extends substantially across the entire width of the loading device.

Claim 4 has been amended herein to insert the term --and-- before "an" on line 2. In addition the term "glide" has been changed to --slide--.

Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to properly depend from claim 2 to thereby provide proper antecedent basis for the term "slide rail".

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion to add --and to prevent jamming of said loading member-- to the last line of the claim.

In view of the amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Iwata et al. '602.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bartelmuss et al.

U.S. Patent No. 6,183,602 to Iwata et al. discloses a loading blade for loading a wire wherein the angle of a blade part in contact with the wire can be adjusted with respect to the wire. In this regard, the blade part 101 is attached by means of an articulated joint to an intermediate part 102 and the change in angel of the blade part is produced by loading hoses 104a and 104b located on either side of the intermediate part. The movement of the loading device with respect

A

to the wire is produced by a loading hose 103 which moves the intermediate part 102 with respect to the base part 105.

U.S. Patent No. 5,660,689 to Bartelmuss discloses a dewatering blade for a wire section having a blade part 4 attached to an intermediate part 3, the intermediate part 3 being attached to a base 2 such that the angle or height of the intermediate part with respect to the base can be adjusted.

Neither of the above references eliminate the problem that the present invention seeks to address. That is, neither of the above references address preventing the jamming of loading blade when said loading blade presses against a moving wire. The inventors of the present invention have found that when the loading blade presses against the wire the loading blade is subject to a torque arising from the wire movement. As a result of this torque the loading blade has a tendency to jam. The inventors have discovered that this jamming problem can be solved by using a bearing roller 100 between the loading blade and the base part, the roller serving to prevent the jamming phenomenon.

The problem encountered in the state of the art arrangements is revealed in the arrangement disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 6,183,602 to Iwata et al. disclosed above. Specifically the intermediate part 102 is arranged to slide along the base part 105 when the pressure in the loading hose is changed. In this type of structure there is a great risk that the intermediate part 102 will jam with respect to the base part. This jamming problem is not solved by the articulated joint 107 since this articulated joint merely serves to enable a change in the angle of the blade part 101.

A

It is noted that the blade disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 5,660,689 is not a loading blade but a stationary dewatering blade, i.e. it does not move during the formation of the web. Thus, in this type of structure there is no need for arrangements which insure the mobility of the dewatering blade.

In view of the above it is submitted that none of the cited references anticipate the claimed invention and/or render the claimed invention obvious.

If it is determined that any fee is required, the Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

According to currently recommended Patent Office policy, the Examiner is specifically authorized to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephonic interview would advance the prosecution of this application.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

By: _____

Paul J. Higgins
Reg. No. 44,152

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 768–3800

A